	D4aQdavS Se	ntence	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YC		
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	x	
3		1 -	1 CD 424 (NDD)
4	V.	1.	l CR 424 (NRB)
5	EARL SETH DAVID		
6	Defendant	x	
7		Ne	ew York, N.Y.
8			pril 10, 2013 :00 p.m.
9			
10	Before:		
11	HON. NAC	MI REICE BUCHWA Di	ALD istrict Judge
12	77		
13	APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JANIS ECHENBERG JAMES J. PASTORE, JR. Assistant United States Attorney		
14			
15			
16			
17	MOSKOWITZ & BOOK LLP Attorneys for Defendant David AVI MOSKOWITZ M. TODD PARKER		
18			
19			
20	-also present-		
21	DEIDRE GORDON HSI		
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 (In open court)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 11 CR 424 United States v. Earl Seth David.

Is the government present and ready to proceed?

MS. ECHENBERG: Yes. Good afternoon, your Honor.

Janis Echenberg and James Pastore for the government. With us at counsel table is Deidre Gordon from Homeland Security

Investigations.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Is defense counsel present and ready to proceed?

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Yes. Good afternoon, your Honor. Avi Moskowitz and Todd Parker for Mr. David who is seated in between us.

THE COURT: Let me begin, as I always do, by confirming that I have received all the submissions that I should have.

First, I have the sentencing letter of Mr. Moskowitz with 24 exhibits dated March 8. Then I have another letter enclosing additional letters from family and friends dated March 11. Then sequentially there is the government's which sentencing memorandum is undated. Then there is Mr. Moskowitz's response to the government's memorandum dated April 8. And, finally, I guess where I should have began is the report of the probation office dated March 26.

So, my first question to you is whether there are any

other documents that I should have received in connection with the sentencing?

MR. MOSKOWITZ: No, your Honor.

MS. ECHENBERG: Nothing from the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me confirm that both parties have received a copy of the report of the probation office.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: We have, your Honor. I've reviewed it with Mr. David.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to it?

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Your Honor, the final report contains all of the objections that I made to the initial report and various footnotes. Other than what's in the report currently in those footnotes, I have no objection.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. ECHENBERG: The government has received it and reviewed it, and we have no objection.

THE COURT: I think, Mr. Moskowitz, the floor is yours.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor.

I begin, your Honor, by noting that what I think is pretty obvious; that this is a difficult case. It's difficult because Mr. David has committed and pled guilty to very serious crimes. It is also difficult, however, because, as I think we indicated in our sentencing memo, there is substantial

mitigating circumstances in this case.

I think from the beginning, your Honor, the government has somewhat successfully, portrayed Mr. David as an evil, diabolical criminal who maliciously defrauded both the government and his clients for more than a decade.

Now, Earl has admitted and accepts full responsibility for his crimes, but the mitigation that we have pointed out in our submission explains somewhat how he got into that situation. Significantly, Judge, I think from my conversations with the government, that there is really no dispute that Mr. David suffers from significant mental illness. We submitted two detailed reports of very established, recognized mental health experts that detail exactly the nature of Earl's mental illness. He suffers both from significant bipolar disorder which went undiagnosed until his arrest in this case, and is still untreated, and a chronic and complex posttraumatic stress disorder which goes back to probably his teenage years, if not earlier.

Now, I point this out, Judge, and I say that I want it very clear, it is not our position that Earl's mental illness excuses his behavior. The criminal conduct here was inexcusable and that's why he pled guilty, and that's why he's accepted responsibility, but it does go a long way towards explaining what happened and how it happened over such a long period of time.

Honor has dealt with someone who suffers from bipolar disorder, but my understanding, based on my experience in the business, so to speak, when someone has bipolar disorder and has manic episodes, they are very productive, but in a crazy way. They view themselves as vulnerable and as super human. Their reality testing and reality understanding is way off, and they do things — and they have extremely poor judgment. That is classic and characteristic of people with bipolar disorder. And that behavior, the behaviors that the government pointed out that your Honor heard about at trial, are typical of people that suffer from bipolar disorder. Again, it's not an excuse, but it is an explanation.

If your Honor looked carefully at the report of Dr. Drob, he specifically talks about the types of things that would cause someone suffering from this illness to do what Earl did. He wrote that "Earl has a serious impairment in reality testing, which causes him to fail to anticipate the consequences of his behavior and to exhibit poor decision-making and judgment."

He then wrote, "As a result of his mental disorder, poor reality testing, impaired judgment and impulsivity,

Mr. David is compromised in his capacity to adequately control his behavior and to fully appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct. While he understands that his behavior in his

immigration law practice was illegal, he focused his own mind on what he believed would be the good that he was doing for his clients. The defendant's capacity to adequately appreciate the wrongfulness of his behavior was fueled by his seriously impaired reality testing and his consequent failure to separate fantasy from reality."

And he concluded that "As a result of his mental disorders, he suffered from a diminished capacity to exercise adequate judgment, to fully appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct, and to control behavior that he ultimately understood to be unethical and illegal."

Again, I stress, we are not minimizing the conduct. We are not excusing the conduct, but there can be little doubt that his mental illness contributed significantly to the behavior.

Now, I focused till now on the bipolar disorder, but as discussed at length in the psychological reports, there's another component to Earl's mental illness, and that is the PTSD, the posttraumatic stress disorder. And that, while it doesn't relate directly to the criminal conduct, it kind of gives you an understanding of what kind of life Mr. David has lived till now. What Dr. Gordon's report shows, and it was a lengthy social history that was done based on interviews both of Mr. David and family members and friends that have known him for a long period of time, is that he has had a particularly

D4aQdavS

Sentence

difficult life marked with significant tragedies and traumas.

Your Honor read, I'm sure, about what's probably the defining trauma in Mr. David's life, which is the accident which took his mother's life when he was 14. In that accident, Earl was in the car, his mother was thrown from the window, was essentially cut in half, and her blood splattered all over Earl. Now, today, today we would understand that a child who goes through that needs counseling and needs help and needs something to help him recover.

Unfortunately, Earl's father -- and I don't know why; maybe it was the times, maybe it was the European background, I don't know why -- but Earl never got a moment's worth of counseling. And I think that Dr. Gordon's report indicates he's never really recovered from that trauma. The way that has manifested itself is while he's recovered enough to function in society, clearly, he graduated college and law school, he had a law practice, you can see the effects of some of those traumas in his personal life.

Earl has had two failed marriages. His first wife who worked in the law practice for a period of time took all his money and took his son — Carey, by the way, is here, flew up from Florida; it's important to his father — and took him and took him to Florida. That was a very difficult event in Mr. David's life. He initially had sought custody of his son, but having gone through the loss of his own mother, decided to

give up Carey and let him be with his mother. But Earl's managed to maintain a relationship with him. Carey wrote to the Court and has shown his support by coming up here today.

Earl's second wife, as your Honor probably knows from reading the report, was herself severely mentally ill, and, remarkably, Earl was the healthy one in that relationship, or the healthier one in that relationship. She had a psychotic break. She, among other things, was found naked in the park one day and shortly thereafter jumped out the third floor window of their apartment. Earl, to his credit, didn't abandon her. He took care of her until he couldn't any more. And they ultimately got divorced.

Now, Earl has managed to re-marry, and his wife

Salome, also known as Hia, is here with their son who is a

little over a year old. As your Honor knows, he was born after

Mr. David's arrest in Canada on this case a little over a

year -- about a year and a half ago.

I think it's interesting to note that despite the tragedies that Earl has suffered, particularly in his childhood or maybe because of it, he's worked hard to maintain a relationship and develop a relationship with his children, and Carey's coming up here today all the way from Florida is indicative that even though they were separated by distance, Earl has managed to maintain a relationship, and one of which was strong enough that Carey on his own chose to come up here.

It's also, your Honor, the experience of having lost a parent as a child that makes this whole situation so painful for Earl because he is now out of his son's life, the baby son. His son is living in Canada with his mother. There is no money. And as a result, she comes down here once every four months, every five months. I think he's seen his son in the five and a half — in the 18 months or so that he's been incarcerated, maybe three or four times. So it's very difficult and painful for him, this separation.

It's significant, Judge, that while many people have gone through what Earl has gone through, might have become bitter and taken it out on other people, Earl has gone in the other direction and has spent his private time trying to do good and trying to help people. And that is evidenced by the letters that your Honor received from friends and family, and particularly from numerous community members, particularly senior citizens who Earl helped by driving them to synagogue, driving them to shopping, picking up their groceries, and doing other acts of kindness.

Your Honor, many defendants who come into this court have done good things, contributed to charity, and all of that is laudable. What makes Earl different than some of them is Earl is not talking about giving his money. He's talking about giving his time and giving up his of his humanity to try and help other people. That doesn't excuse anything that he did,

but, again, it is something that weighs in his favor when the Court considers whether he is really the monster that the government is trying to paint him as.

I just want to touch briefly, Judge, on some of the other 3553(a) factors that the Court obviously should consider. The government has contended that a guideline sentence is necessary to deter Earl, and I significantly and seriously dispute that.

First of all, I think Earl has exhibited and shown his real remorse. He waived expedition after his son was born. He came here. He proffered shortly after he came, attempting to cooperate. He pled guilty shortly after he came, and he did that — his proffers were, I will tell the Court, it's very unusual that right up front the government says, you can proffer, but we don't think we'll ever give him a 5K. That was the first proffer. He agreed to do it anyway.

When the government called — in the months prior to trial, when Ms. Echenberg and Mr. Pastore called, it was made very clear that he's not getting a cooperation agreement. He can come in. He can answer our questions. If we think that he's told the truth, we'll let the Court know about that, but he isn't getting a 5K. He's not getting a cooperation agreement. And Mr. David agreed to do that. I think it was really not very fair of the government to downplay that. It's not every day that a defendant comes in with no promises, in

fact, with negative promises, and says, sure, I'll help you out, I'll answer your questions, no promises. And, in fact, he got, if anything, very little for it.

And what's significant, Judge, from my position as a practitioner, is by agreeing to talk to the government, answering their questions in late last year, Mr. David agreed to put off his sentencing which was scheduled for December of last year. The result of that, Judge, was that rather than sentencing Mr. David on a cold record, your Honor got to hear a trial at which Mr. David was vilified by both sides without an opportunity to defend himself and that could -- I don't think it can help, but taint the Court's view or influence the Court's view, I should say, of Mr. David.

I will tell the Court, it was a strong consideration as to whether or not we were going to go ahead with that because there is an advantage to arguing this out without your Honor having heard a one-sided defenseless presentation of what Mr. David is and what he's like and so on.

The point of all this, your Honor, is Mr. David has done everything he can to show remorse, to show that he's accepted responsibility, and, yes, he's got a very bad past. He's done a lot of things that were wrong. Your Honor, the biggest factor that I think you should consider in terms of what kind of sentence Earl needs to be deterred is till this case, till I had him evaluated and reports came in, his mental

illness was never diagnosed and never treated. Now that it has been diagnosed, he can get the treatment that he needs.

Clearly, he's going to need medication, which he hasn't gotten, but which now that there's a diagnosis — and, hopefully, the Bureau of Prisons will give him the appropriate medication — it can go a long way towards controlling the type of manic behavior that got him into this trouble in the first place.

That should give the Court some comfort that a long prison sentence is not necessary to deter him.

With respect to the question of general deterrence, your Honor, for others similarly situated, whether it's two years or three years or four years, that type of sentence for someone like Earl, others like Earl, is a significant sentence. Giving him six or seven years as the guidelines call for is simply not necessary. It's more than is required. Judge Rakoff has pointed that out ad nauseam in terms of the types of sentences imposed in similar type cases. He's pointed out that for a defendant like this with his background, this type of sentence it is more than necessary; you can do much less and still have the same deterrent effect, and it would deter not only specifically, but generally, people in a similar situation.

I point out, Judge, that every day that Mr. David has spent in jail has been very, very difficult for him. It started in Canada where the commissions, as I understand it,

were not as luxurious, we should say, as the conditions at the MCC, they're even harsher. And here at the MCC for a year and a half, it has been no picnic. And he's felt this. He's a man of slight stature. He's been threatened. He's been beaten. This has not been an easy stretch for Mr. David.

As for what is just punishment and respect for the law, I submit, as I did in my letter, Judge, that the guideline sentence or the recommended guidelines range here is not necessary to achieve either a just punishment or respect for the law. I think, in fact, one can make the argument that if the sentence is too harsh, the opposite would be true. I think that a guideline sentence here would not reflect the mitigating factors appropriately and adequately, and I'd ask the Court to weigh the mitigation as well as the seriousness of the crime.

Finally, Judge, one last point. Obviously, Earl is not alone in this, but it is certainly true and something that the Court can consider. When the client's family is outside the country, the impact of incarceration is that much more difficult. Earl's wife is not an American citizen. She is not even a Canadian citizen. She is of Mexican nationality. She lives in Canada with their baby. She can't come and live in the United States at this point. She doesn't have a means of support even if she could come, and, as a result, Earl is isolated. His teenage son lives in Florida and comes up every few months when he can. His wife comes every few months when

she can with the baby, but he's really isolated, and, as a result, every day that he spends is, in many respects, that much more difficult than that served by the average inmate. And I think that is something the Court can consider in fashioning a sentence.

So, your Honor, I ask the Court to recognize not only the crimes that Earl has committed, but the fact that he has accepted responsibility, he's shown remorse, and there are substantial mitigating factors, particularly his mental illness, and I ask the Court to weigh all of those factors and impose a sentence below the recommended guidelines range to reflect not only his crime but also the mitigation.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. David, would you like to say anything?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I would, your Honor. I'm very

nervous, so just bear with me.

THE COURT: That's fine, if you'd like to stay seated, that's fine also.

THE DEFENDANT: OK. Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, the Assistant U.S. Attorneys, the special agents, my lawyer, my son, my wife, my baby, my son are here for my support. I would like to state for the record that what I say today comes from my heart and my soul. I always speak the truth, so help me God. I am truly remorseful, contrite, repentful for my criminal activity that landed me in jail for

the past 547 days and nights, which are very long, dark and mentally painful. This has given me much time to reflect and introspect.

I'm ashamed, embarrassed and humiliated for breaking the law. I know what I -- I recognize what I did was wrong. I take full responsibility for my actions, and I can only blame myself for my downfall and destruction. I regret my past what I did. I truly regret my past actions. If I could change the past, I would. Unfortunately, I cannot. I stand before this Court as a disbarred attorney and as a broken and humble human being. I made the wrong choices and decisions, and I'm paying severely for the consequences of my former actions by staying in jail far away from my family.

But let me make this clear to the Court, I broke the law, and I deserve to be punished. I've learned my lesson. I got the message. I will never repeat that mistake again of breaking the law. I am deterred for the rest of my life from committing any crime. Since my arrest and my incarceration, I have learned to respect and obey the law.

I keep in touch with my wife and infant son, and Carey by phone, email and letters.

During the past 12 months, I was evaluated by mental health professionals, and I learned for the first time I suffer from bipolar disorder which significantly contribute to my poor decision-making. I also suffer from posttraumatic stress

disorder, which also explains why I have been unable to escape the recurring and horrible nightmares for the car accident which killed my mother, Frances David, when I was 14.

Your Honor, I was originally scheduled to be sentenced on August 15, 2012. My lawyer adjourned the date with the Court's permission to December 12, 2012. Moreover, a period prior to my sentencing, the U.S. Attorney's Office contacted my lawyer if I was willing to cooperate in regards to the upcoming trial of my co-defendants that was to be held in January 2013. In good faith and without hesitation and without any promise and any letter of cooperation, I took the responsibility to voluntarily assist the government. I spent many hours with the Assistant U.S. Attorneys, the special agents, my lawyer as we went over the evidence assisted in trial. They treated me with dignity and respect.

Your Honor, I want to make right whatever wrong I have done in my past. I will consciously live with the memory of this crime for the rest of my life. I won't repeat it ever again. I intend to educate the public. I promise to respect and obey the law, and not be in danger of committing any crime.

Life is full of situations and events that come our way that require us to make choices and decisions. I will carefully weigh the consequences of my actions, and I'll make the right choices and decisions. Your Honor, I will attend mental health counseling as well. I know I need mental health.

D4aQdavS

Sentence

I will get that mental health, your Honor.

For the past -- your Honor, for the past 18 months, my family is suffering with pain and anguish over my imprisonment through no fault of their own but because of my stupid actions. I have not been there for holidays or birthday parties and am basically out of their life. I'm like the living dead cut off from society. My wife is like a widow, and my children are like orphans. I only saw my infant son five times since he was born, and now I didn't see him yet, but now the six time. My wife has informed me he is walking. I don't know my own son. I can only blame myself.

Carey has been kind enough to come up to me several times. He is here, your Honor. You asked about him when I first came. He's been a very strong support for me, your Honor. I appreciate it.

Your Honor, I am concerned and worried that if I'm handed a lengthy sentence, I am going to lose my family, and my wife is struggling. In jail you do learn what's really important in life, and that is your freedom and your family. I will never take that for granted again.

Please let me reenter society so that I can re-build my life, be a productive member of the community, a loyal husband to my wife, Salome, a mentor and father to my son, Carey, and a loving and caring father to my infant son, Jacob, who I don't even know.

I will respect and obey your order as well. I will not let this Court down. I don't smoke. I don't drink. I don't do drugs, heaven forbid. I just want the privilege to work hard to support my family. Please tender just mercy and please mete out my sentence with kindness and leniency, if not for my wife's sake, at least for my children's sake.

Thank you and God bless you.

THE COURT: Ms. Echenberg.

MS. ECHENBERG: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

As your Honor is aware, this case represents one of the largest immigration frauds that was ever committed in the United States. It spanned 13 years. It involved 25,000 applications, at least, that were fraudulent. And Mr. David was the mastermind of that fraud. I don't think the government has tried to portray him as evil or diabolical or as a monster. I think what we have tried to portray in our submission and the way that the facts of this case portray him is as the architect, as the mastermind of this fraud.

The scheme was his brain child. He identified the loophole with labor certifications that could allow people to claim they were hiring people when they really weren't. He recruited almost all of the people that participated in the fraud. A lot of them were his former clients and his family members. He trained all of them in how to commit this fraud, and he also coached the sponsors, the people who claimed to

employ aliens. He coached them as to what they should say if immigration came calling.

At every opportunity, Mr. David avoided detection and he avoided prosecution. When he was disbarred, he set up a separate office in an apartment building, and he got other lawyers to put their name on the law firm door, but he continued to run the fraud secretly.

And then when the agents started investigating the fraud, he left the country. He went to Canada, and he continued to be very actively engaged with the fraud remotely. He continued to fill out paperwork. He continued to coach and advise other people as to how to conduct the fraud, and he mediated disputes among the employees from abroad.

And when he was finally arrested, he continued to deceive. He lied in a hearing before the Canadian court. He lied about why he was in Canada, but ultimately after being confronted several times, he conceded that, yes, he was continuing to conduct legal business related to a New York law firm even though he had lost his New York license.

As we mentioned in our submission, this was not the first time that Earl David was engaged in illegal conduct. In the 1990s, he was involved in another financial fraud. He was caught, and he cooperated and he got immunity for that. At the same time that he was cooperating and getting immunity, he was getting this other fraud, this massive immigration fraud going.

D4aQdavS

So he was undeterred. He didn't stop. He just kept going and committed an even worse, even more expansive fraud.

Sentence

He claims that he was merely trying to help his clients, and that's what drew him to commit this fraud. And while that may have been a piece of it, most of these clients weren't really helped. A lot of them, at most, got a year of work authorization when they had paid to get full permanent residency.

Now, we don't argue that the clients were deceived in the sense that they were legitimately entitled to those benefits. The clients were certainly part of the fraud as well, but they paid large amounts of money thinking that they were going to get permanent residency, and part of Mr. David's fraud was to substitute one client for another and get more and more money from different clients. So clients that thought they were on a path to a permanent residency lost the benefits that they thought they had paid for, and most of the time they didn't even know that they were out of status. So any claim that he was truly trying to help people is really disingenuous.

Mr. David profited handsomely from this fraud. He agreed as part of his plea to forfeit \$2.5 million to agree to a \$2.5 million forfeiture order, which represents his proceeds from the fraud. We've laid out in our submission the type of income that he was receiving; but just to give your Honor a brief summary, prior to 2006, so from 1996 to 2006 when he was

in the office running the fraud every day, a very low estimate is that clients were being charged \$5,000 each, and there were thousands and thousands of clients, and Mr. David was taking the lion's share of those payments.

In 2006 when he went to Canada, at first he was getting ten percent of the profits through another co-defendant, and even he admits that clients were being charged even more in that later time period.

We have records showing \$98,000 going to him -laundered to him through the "Code of the Heart," his book, in
2007 and 2008. So any claim that he wasn't making money from
this fraud really doesn't hold up.

With regard to his cooperation, we certainly didn't intend to downplay what he did. In our submission, we dedicated a paragraph to letting your Honor know that he did meet with us. He met with the government initially when he first came here, but at that point really the fraud had been uncovered because he had been avoiding detection for so long, that the agents had really figured out the fraud and figured out the participants so there really wasn't substantial assistance that he could provide at that point.

It is true that we communicated with Mr. Moskowitz shortly before trial in particular regarding a defendant who ultimately pled shortly before trial, but we did meet with Mr. David, and we don't dispute that he answered our questions

honestly, and, in particular, during trial through his lawyer he did respond very quickly to a question that we asked. So we don't downplay that, but we don't think that that warrants a below guideline sentence given the scope of the fraud and the conduct here.

While Mr. David's personal circumstances are tragic, we don't think that excuses his behavior, and it does not warrant a below guideline sentence. The first time that the government saw the psychological evaluations was when we received the submission, the same as your Honor, and we are not in a position to dispute the diagnosis, nor would we dispute the diagnosis, but we do disagree that bipolar disease is what led him to commit this crime.

We agree with the defense that it's quite surprising that someone who is purportedly so severely mentally ill could commit this massive, multilayer, very sophisticated crime. As Dr. Drob said in his report, there's no question that the defendant understood that his behavior was both illegal and wrong. He knew what he was doing. In committing this fraud, he was calculating, he was deceptive, and he remained undeterred for over a decade.

Ultimately, we agree with the probation department, that while the defendant's mental health issues and traumatic childhood certainly merit consideration by the Court, they do not warrant a sentence outside of the guidelines range of 78 to

1 97 months.

Given the scope of the fraud, given Earl David's role in the fraud, and particularly the fact that he used his legal training to commit this fraud, it's the government's view that a guideline sentence here is appropriate.

THE COURT: Did you want to respond at all? I'm not requiring it.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Judge, I understand that. Two brief points, relatively minor. First of all, obviously we're not claiming that Mr. David didn't make money. He made money from the scheme. I think that's obvious. What is worth noting, however, is even when he was in Canada, supposedly hiding, according to the government, he was filing tax returns and paying taxes on the money that he was making and reporting where he was on his tax returns. So it kind of undercuts the argument that he's hiding when he's hiding in plain sight —

THE COURT: I don't think they said he was hiding. I think they said --

MR. MOSKOWITZ: The government's claim was that he ran away to hide.

THE COURT: Well, that's pretty documented in the trial record.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Your Honor, I obviously was not able to address the trial record or the witnesses who said so, but --

D4aQdavS

Sentence

THE COURT: No, there are documents. It's not a matter of believing people.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Your Honor, the point is he -- even when he's making this money, he is reporting it, he's paying taxes on it. And the issue with the mental health problems here, Judge -- and I tried to make this argument; maybe I didn't make it clear enough -- the fact that he suffers from bipolar disorder doesn't mean he's not intelligent, doesn't mean he's not capable, doesn't mean he can't function to a certain degree in society. The problem was that the illness severely impacted on his judgment and his ability to control his actions. And that's the point.

THE COURT: All right. Nobody -- no psychologist, no psychiatrist, no licensed social worker is going to tell anybody that a manic episode lasts for 13 years. So there is just a limit as to how far he can go with this.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Considerable time has been spent reviewing the lengthy submissions, both from the probation department, from the defense and from the government.

To explain the sentence that I will impose, let me start by discussing the seriousness of the crime. I think it was very clear from the submissions that most of the people, if not all of them, who submitted letters, really were not informed about what Mr. David's criminal activity was here. I

think it's important because, of course, the seriousness of the crime is central to any sentence, but it's also important for people in the courtroom to be more aware of what was involved here.

We begin with the length of the crime. Mr. David has pled to having been involved in this immigration fraud from 1996 to 2009, a period of 13 years. There is also the question of the extent of the criminal activity. As the government mentioned, the number of applications, most of which were fraudulent, numbered roughly 25,000. There was a serious consequence to this. The result was a distortion of the immigration system. Individuals undeserving received benefits to which they were not entitled, but inevitably it also affected the deserving because there are not unlimited resources, and there is not unlimited staff.

To the extent that the clients of the David Law Firm and its successors were not active fraudsters themselves, presumably these were not wealthy people who did not have a spare \$2,000 or \$5,000 to lose if they did not get the benefit they hoped for.

This enterprise, the David Law Firm was also incredibly complex, and it needed to be to accomplish the fraud. It needed many employees, including employees with a variety of language skills to facilitate a fraud clientele, and the number of defendants involved in this case is, I believe,

23; and if I'm right, 16 of them were employees of the firm. I find it particularly significant and disturbing that Mr. David did not hesitate to recruit relatives and the vulnerable, and I very much doubt that were it not for his manipulative ways, that these people would have become involved in the crime that they did. So much for the suggestion that he is simply a kind soul who would never want to hurt anyone. The truth is he hurt the people that he got involved in his scheme. The enterprise had multiple sequential locations and needed to have individuals with multiple skills to carry out the fraud.

The David lawyers, accountants, people with computer skills, needed an insider at the department of labor, needed phony sponsors, and eventually it was the creation of connection to Canada so that Mr. David could continue to participate after he left the country clearly to avoid potential prosecution.

There has been a lot of downplaying of the amount of money involved, but let's do a little math. \$2,000 per client times 25,000 clients is \$50 million. Up to 3,000 per client, you get to \$75 million. This was very lucrative. Apart from this crime, Mr. David has demonstrated an inability to conform his conduct to the law. He committed securities fraud back in 1991, and he did cooperate. So he disgorged \$10,000 and paid a fine of \$5,000. As a consequence, he was suspended as a lawyer both in New Jersey and New York, and at the time he argued to

the disciplinary boards the same kind of mitigating argument that he's making today.

But it didn't work as a wakeup call. He continued to practice law and committed this fraud, and then he sought to be reinstated to the bar of New Jersey, and there's no reason to believe much of what he told them. And we know that even after he got arrested here, he was found to have been lying to a Canadian judge by that judge.

Now, the defense has placed a great deal of emphasis on the report of Simone Gordon and Dr. Drob. I start by accepting the proposition of the presentation of the defendant as having had a difficult and traumatic childhood, and have no doubt that there are lasting consequences of those experiences which would affect an individual's interpersonal relationships. But the issue for purposes of sentencing is not whether the defendant has entered into bad marriages or made bad marriage choices or has additional emotional needs as a consequence, but whether the residual emotional consequences of the defendant's childhood are responsible for his criminal behavior.

Neither Dr. Drob nor Ms. Gordon denied that Mr. David knew the difference between right and wrong, both as an ethical and as a legal matter. And it's absolutely obvious that the therapists were never provided with the details of the complexity of this scheme which, in my view, drastically undermines their suggestion that his psychological conditions

caused him to engage in a decade or more than a decade of crime.

Further, there is no suggestion by anyone that having bipolar disorder causes individuals to engage in immigration fraud, let alone, as I mentioned earlier, having manic episodes that last for 13 years.

As I noted earlier, the defendant used a somewhat less involved version of this argument to avoid a longer suspension from the bar. Nevertheless, despite the awareness of the psychological issues, which he used to his advantage, Mr. David chose not to address those issues, but instead to rely on his untreated issues to avoid the guideline sentence here.

Quite frankly, both conclusory statements of the retained experts and his counsel are internally inconsistent and to me fundamentally illogical and unpersuasive.

So I do not doubt that Mr. David, like many criminals, has found a way to rationalize his long-standing and repeated conduct, but the proffered rationalization here is just blatant nonsense. Try as he will to justify his crime and the dollars that he made by claiming that he was just bringing families together, this immigration fraud had nothing to do with reuniting families. It was about getting labor certifications to keep people here, most of whom probably had their families here, and any relationship to bringing family members into this country was a very distant one at best.

So, having considered all of these factors, I am going to sentence Mr. David to 60 months in custody. I'm placing him on supervised release for two years. I can say now that I will release him from supervised release if he chooses to leave the United States at the conclusion of his sentence, terminate it early.

There is a special assessment of \$200 imposed. I will recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that he be placed in a facility where he may receive treatment for his mental health issues. And I impose the mandatory standard and special conditions set out at pages 29 to 30.

Mr. Moskowitz.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Your Honor, two relatively minor issues. I understand the Court's recommendation with respect to a facility where he can get mental health treatment. If it is available in Otisville, I would ask the Court to recommend that as a place where, among other things, his religious needs can be taken care of, your Honor.

THE COURT: I can, if you want, recommend Otisville and leave it at that.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: That would be great.

THE COURT: And you and he can make the appeals to the prison authorities for whatever you want.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor. And with respect to the credit for time already served, obviously --

THE COURT: He doesn't get credit for the time in Canada, I believe, under the law.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Well, I'd ask if the Court can recommend that he be given --

THE COURT: I was going to give him five and a half years, so he's already -- and I dropped it to five, so he's already gotten it.

MR. MOSKOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. ECHENBERG: Your Honor, if your Honor could just state on the record -- I assume you adopt the PSR the guidelines range.

THE DEFENDANT: I think the guidelines calculation is totally correct. It was pled to, and one might note inconsistent with the argument, that he agreed to points as being an organizer and leader. So the suggestion that was made by Ms. Gordon which was really amazing that he was — he did not have the traits to execute this plan. That's my point from before. No one really chose to tell her what was really involved here, so she could go and write this. But it just doesn't conform to the reality.

MS. ECHENBERG: Three other very quick points, your Honor. I assume your sentence is concurrent on the two counts.

THE COURT: Sure. And supervised release as well.

MS. ECHENBERG: And we wanted to move to dismiss Counts Two and Four, and also ask that your Honor sign the

order of forfeiture that we had passed up. 1 2 THE COURT: I've just signed the order of forfeiture, and the Counts Two and Four are dismissed. 3 4 MR. MOSKOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 MS. ECHENBERG: And although the defendant pled guilty 7 and he has waived his right to appeal a sentence that is out of the guidelines range, if you could advise him. 8 9 THE COURT: Sure. Absolutely. The defendant is 10 advised that both I think he waived it in his plea agreement 11 that he has the right to appeal the sentence I've imposed 12 within 14 days. MR. MOSKOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor. 13 14 MS. ECHENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 15 (Adjourned) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Sentence

D4aQdavS